

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on April 14, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action of April 14, 2009, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059995 to Takabayashi (hereinafter referred to as "Takabayashi") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014368 to Leurig (hereinafter referred to as "Leurig"). Claims 3, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Leurig in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,145,681 to Kato (hereinafter referred to as "Kato"). No other issues were raised.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 13 and 16 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-17 remain pending in the application.

Interview Summary

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for their time and input during the Examiner interview conducted with Applicant's representative on August 12, 2009.

During the interview, it was pointed out by Applicant's representative that

neither Takabayashi nor Leung teach or suggest transmitting address information from a server to a client device, for causing the client device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Takabayashi teaches inputting a URL including an IP address of a print server to acquire print status information via the print server (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0059]), but does not teach or suggest transmitting address information to the client. Leurig teaches a printer connected to a client, without a server intervening therebetween (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3 of Leurig), but does not teach or suggest transmitting address information to the client to cause the client to obtain print status information. Further reasons for the patentability of the instant claims over the Takabayashi and Leurig references are explained in more detail below.

Furthermore, as discussed during the Interview, support for the transmittal of address information, as recited in claim 1, is provided at least in paragraph [0055] and Figure 6 of the publication of the instant application, where is it disclosed that a uniform resource identifier (URI) that indicates a web page of the printer device is transmitted from the print server to the client in a Web page switching request. For example, as recited in the dependent claim 4, the address information can comprise “a uniform resource identifier of a Web page indicating the state of processing of the transmitted print data.”

Accordingly, the claims as amended are believed to be allowable over the references of record. Early notice as to the allowability of the claims is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-14 and 16-17
over Takabayashi and Leurig**

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Takabayashi and Leurig (*see, e.g.*, pages 2-10 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi and Leurig because neither of the references teaches or suggests the method as claimed that is executed by a server capable of communicating with a client device and a printer device through a network, the client device being different from the printer device, the method comprising:

“receiving a printing request from the client device;

transmitting print data to the printer device selected in the client device in accordance with the received printing request; and

transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data” (emphasis added).

The method as claimed may thus allow a client device to acquire the state of processing of the transmitted print data from the printer device without going through the server, and without requiring any prior registration of the address information of the printer by a user, since the address information (e.g., an address of a web page for receiving print status information from the printer) is transmitted to the client device by the server (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0055] of publication of instant application). Embodiments of the method as claimed may thus reduce the workload on a server, because the server is not required to

transmit the state of printing to the client device.

Takabayashi does not teach or suggest such a method executed by a server in which address information is transmitted to the client device that causes the client device to acquire a processing state from a printer without going through a server, as recited in the claim. Instead, as admitted in the Office Action, “Takabayashi does not disclose that the client device acquires the print status without going through the server” (third full paragraph of page 3 of Office Action). Moreover, in the section referred to in the Office Action, Takabayashi teaches that “[w]hen a Web browser is activated and a URL including an IP address of the printer server 20 is input, the CPU 30a of the client 30 acquires the current status data of the printers 50 and 60 from the print server 20 via the LAN cable 12” (paragraph [0059], lines 3-7). Thus, Takabayashi clearly teaches that the print status is received via the print server, as opposed to directly from the printers 50 and 60, and thus Takabayashi does not teach or suggest acquiring a state of processing of the transmitted print data from the printer device without going through the server, as recited in the claim.

Furthermore, Takabayashi does not teach or suggest transmitting address information from a server to a client device to cause the client device to acquire the state of processing of the transmitted print data. It is noted that in the section referred to in the Office Action and quoted above, Takabayashi merely teaches that “a URL including an IP address of the print server 20 is input” (paragraph [0059], lines 4-5), presumably by the user. Thus, Takabayashi teaches that a web address may be input (e.g., by a user) to receive information from a print server, but Takabayashi does not teach or suggest that address information is

transmitted to a client device by a server, to cause the client device to acquire print status information.

Leurig does not make up for the deficiencies of Takabayashi, and in particular does not teach or suggest transmitting address information to the client device for causing the client device to acquire a print status without going through a server. Leurig teaches a secure system for printing negotiable instruments using a central server that authorizes the printing (*see, e.g.*, Abstract). In the section referred to in the Office Action, Leurig teaches that a client computer 108 communicates with a printer to print the negotiable instrument, and that “[a]fter printing is complete, printer 110 provides a status response (step 322) to client system 108” (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0048]). Thus, Leurig teaches that a client computer communicates directly with a printer to get status information, but does not teach or suggest transmitting address information (*e.g.*, web address information) to the client computer from a server to cause the client computer to acquire the status information from the printer.

Instead, Leurig teaches that the server acts to verify that a client computer is authorized to print on a particular printer (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0046]), such as by requesting a serial number or other identifying information from the printer (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0046]). If it is determined that the client computer is authorized, then the server also transmits a data file including a print job to the client computer (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0047]-[0048]), with the client computer then providing the file to the printer for printing. However, nowhere in any of these transmissions does Leurig teach or suggest that that address information is transmitted to the client computer from the server. Indeed, it is considered that one

of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the user would instead need to preliminarily register such address information to obtain status information from the printer on the client computer, according to the system of Leurig, as the address information is not otherwise taught as being transmitted to the client computer.

It can be further understood from viewing the figures of Leurig why it would not be necessary to provide the transmission of address information from a server to a client computer in the system of Leurig, to cause the client computer to acquire print status information. This is because, as seen for example in Figs. 2-3 of Leurig, the printer 110 appears to be directly connected to the client computer 108, as opposed to having the client computer being connected to the printer via an intermediary server. Thus, the system of Leurig has no need for providing address information to the client computer to circumvent an intermediary server, and obtain direct communications between the client computer and printer, because the printer and client computer are already directly connected.

Accordingly, as neither Takabayashi nor Leurig teach or suggest a method executed by a server comprising “transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data,” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1, it is considered that claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of the references. Claims 2 and 4-5 depend from claim 1, and thus are also patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi and Leurig for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 8 is similar to claim 1, in that claim 8 is directed to an information processing device capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device through a network, the external device being different from the printer device, the information processing device comprising:

“a request receiving unit configured to receive a printing request from the external device;

a data transmission unit configured to transmit print data to the printer device selected in the external device in accordance with the printing request received by the request receiving unit; and

a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the information processing apparatus, a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit” (emphasis added). Accordingly, as neither Takabayashi nor Leurig teach or suggest transmitting address information from an information processing device to an external device for causing the device to acquire print status from a printer without going through the information processing apparatus, as has been discussed for claim 1 above, it is considered that claim 8 as well as claims 9 and 11-12 depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer-readable medium having a program stored thereon for controlling a computer of a server to execute a method that is similar to that of claim 1, and in particular comprises a step of “transmitting, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of

the transmitted print data.” Accordingly, it is considered that claim 13, as well as claims 14 and 16-17 depending therefrom, are patentable over Takabayashi and Leurig for at least the same reasons, discussed above, as claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-14 and 16-17 are patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi and Leurig, and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over these references is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 3, 10 and 15 over Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato

Claims 3, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato (*see, e.g.*, pages 11-13 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, is patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato, because none of the references teaches or suggests the method as claimed. In particular, as discussed above, the method of claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi and Leurig because neither of the references teaches or suggests “transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data” (emphasis added), as recited in the claim. Instead, Takabayashi teaches that print status is received by a client computer via a print server (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0059]), and Leurig teaches that a print job is transmitted from a server to a printer via a client computer (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0047]-[0048]), but neither of the references teaches or suggests transmitting address information from a server to a client device to cause the client device to acquire print status information from a printer.

Kato does not make up for the deficiencies of Takabayashi and Leurig. Instead, Kato is referred to in the Office Action for its teaching of superimposing scanned images on image data (*see, e.g.*, column 8, lines 18-24). Thus, Kato also does not teach or suggest transmitting address information from a server to a client device to cause the client device to acquire print status information from a printer, as in the method as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 1, as well as claim 3 depending therefrom, are considered to be patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato, because none of the references teaches or suggests the step of transmitting the address information from the server to the client device, as in the method as claimed.

Claim 8, from which claim 10 depends, similarly recites “a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the information processing apparatus, a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit” (emphasis added), and thus claim 8 as well as claim 10 depending therefrom are also considered to be patentable over Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato, because none of the references teaches or suggests transmitting address information from an information processing device to an external device for causing the device to acquire print status from a printer without going through the information processing apparatus, as discussed for claim 1 above.

Claim 13, from which claim 15 depends, is directed to a computer-readable medium having a program stored thereon for controlling a computer of a server to execute a method that is similar to that of claim 1, and in particular

comprises a step of “transmitting, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data.”

Accordingly, it is considered that claim 13, as well as claim 15 depending therefrom, are patentable over Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato for at least the same reasons, discussed above, as claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 3, 10 and 15 are considered to be patentable over the teachings of Takabayashi, Leurig and Kato, and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over these references is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

8/12/2009

/Abigail Cotton/

Date

Abigail Cotton, Reg. No. 52,773
Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3351
Fax: (949) 932-3560